

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Pye Solar](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Date: 05 October 2026 23:13:14

[REDACTED]

Good evening

I submitted my comments at the pre-examination stage on 10th June 2026, in my capacity as both a District Councillor in Bunwell, which covers the village of Great Moulton, and also as a resident in Tivetshall.

I am repeating what I stated again for clarity but I am also adding additional points as part of my submission which have come to light since the Dunston Hall hearings, specifically regarding Sites 1 and 2 rather than the project as a whole. I am sending this from my personal email copied to my councillor email address.

Firstly, I would like to express my shock that Tivetshall was not included in the scheme description letter that my husband and I received as residents at the beginning of May 2026. Apart from Great Moulton, I believe that no other village in South Norfolk will be affected as much as Tivetshall will be by the East Pye scheme. These two villages between them will be hosting the majority of the infrastructure, which comprises a 400kv National Grid substation; a 400kv project substation; a 400kv substation and BESS; and several new pylons (mostly replacing existing but taller). As far as I know, Tivetshall Parish Council were not even approached by East Pye, at any stage in the consultation process, unlike Great Moulton.

This is a very rural community who will be heavily impacted by this amount of infrastructure in one small area. The B1134 in Tivetshall is proposed as the main access for all vehicles connected with the site. Although this makes sense given that it runs directly from the A140 artery, this road is also being proposed as one of National Grid's Norwich to Tilbury haul roads, as the new pylon line will cross the road a couple of miles to the west.

If both get approved, then we would have five years of heavy traffic and disruption, with both schemes running mostly concurrently on what is already a very busy road, with many HGVs. I would hope that logistical coordination would be carried out by both projects, working together so that the roads do not become gridlocked with lorries.

The plans also point out various 'pinch points' along this road, which are primarily very tight corners where visibility is poor and the road would need widening, or vegetation/signs would need removal. It is imperative that there are speed limits in place throughout the construction process. I would also hope that it is obvious where it makes sense to widen the road and where it does not. We need further clarity on whether East Pye means to widen these pinch points on the north or south of the road.

Station Road is lined along the stretch between Lodge Road and the BESS site with some beautiful, healthy veteran trees. There is no need for any of these trees to be removed. Finally, the more recent HGV route that has been proposed to access the National Grid Substation site in Great Moulton is completely unsuitable. Lodge Road and Frith Way are single track roads, with very few passing points. I understand the latest idea is to cut down many veteran oak trees (those further up on Frith Way now have TPOs and those on Lodge Road are of equal age and status), and to widen Lodge

Road into a two lane road. This would mean destroying residents' front gardens and driveways. As East Pye have stated that there will be not be any compulsory purchase of houses and gardens, I do not see how this would be possible.

I am also astounded that as far as I can tell, there is little to no mention of the sensitive receptors in Tivetshall on Station Road (Site 1) that directly face the BESS site. There are five cottages that will be directly in front of the 400kv Substation associated with the BESS and yet when I read the Environmental Statement Volume 3 (ref EN0110114), Fernleigh Farm appears to be the only one listed. Three of these are terraced cottages that are on the same side of the road as the BESS site and will be less than 50m (the supposed buffer zone) from the substation. The other three are directly facing the BESS substation, with no hedging or screening, on the other side of the road. How can this be permissible?

And is there a reason why the 400kv substation is located in front of the BESS? As the substation is likely to make more noise, and is visually much taller, surely it would be less impactful both visually and aurally to situate the substation behind the BESS, making it less visible from the road and further away from the cottages that back onto this site. There has also been no clarity as to whether this substation will use air-insulated or gas-insulated switchgear. The former is significantly louder, and has been described as creating sharp, loud bangs or crackling and buzzing when wet.

Moving up to Great Moulton where I am a councillor, there are many properties listed as being at 'High' risk of adverse effects from the siting of the National Grid Substation. Despite trawling through the documents, I cannot seem to find what mitigation is being suggested for these properties. As we know, no amount of screening can ever hide a substation and it would take decades for trees to even begin to do so.

Referring to the Environmental Statement Volume 3, we are told that the National Grid Substation is located over a Principal Aquifer and within a Drinking Safeguard Zone. Surely despite any precautions East Pye say they will take, this is a completely inappropriate place to build a major piece of permanent infrastructure. The Project Substation is also proposed to be built over the same aquifer.

Additionally, why are we told that sensitive water receptors are located within the site and have the potential to be impacted by the scheme, and there should be appropriate mitigation, only to then be informed that the impacts of the scheme on these receptors have been assessed as 'not significant'? And while we are on the subject of water, this site is being proposed at a time when East Anglia has been officially classified by the EA as severely water stressed. The amount of water that will be needed during construction process, not to mention if there was ever a fire at any of the sites, means the whole region will suffer at a time when water is only going to become more scarce as climate change increases.

Regarding the solar fields themselves, I see no promise of sheep grazing, wildflower meadows or bee-keeping. These were lies that we were told during the public consultations about how the land would be managed under the solar panels. So much more could be done with the ground underneath the panels. What about agrivoltaics as a concept for example? And where is the biodiversity net gain across the entire site? It does not seem anything like a net gain to me, rather a net loss. The number of trees that will be felled cannot be ameliorated by planting more trees. It takes 30/40 years for a tree to start absorbing anything like as much carbon as a mature or veteran tree.

What about the cumulative impact? Quite apart from situating huge industrial

infrastructure in a couple of square miles of rural fields, sandwiched between two small villages, there is also increasing evidence that when a permanent NG Substation is built, planning applications for data centres will follow. Indeed, we already have news of a data centre planning application about to be submitted in South Norfolk. Again, I refer to my concerns about water scarcity. A data centre water consumption can be compared to that of an entire town.

Why have we heard nothing from National Grid about their substation associated with this project? I know that our MP Adrian Ramsay is still waiting for answers to questions put to them weeks' ago about this site. I do not feel this proposal meets any of their stated Horlock Rules regarding the siting of a new substation.

Finally, regarding the proposed pylons. National Grid's Norwich to Tilbury project is proposing new 50m high pylons. So what is the need for the four new pylons proposed by East Pye (replacing three existing, and creating one new) to be up to 61m high?

We must have large-scale renewable energy projects in the UK and we must progress them as quickly as possible. However, the proposed site for the infrastructure relating to this project is to my mind completely untenable for all the reasons I have outlined here.

Yours sincerely

Suzanne Wateridge